



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,805	11/27/2006	Paul Morrison	P70884US0	6088
136	7590	08/06/2008	EXAMINER	
JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC			SIGLER, JAY R	
400 SEVENTH STREET N.W.				
SUITE 600			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20004			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/06/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/553,805	MORRISON ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	JAY R. SIGLER	3733

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 November 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 48-62 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 48-62 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 27 January 2006

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Specification*

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet **within the range of 50 to 150 words**. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is not within the specified range of words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
3. Claim 51 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 3, "light cable" is repeated. Appropriate correction is required.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. Claims 48-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice.
  - a. Claim 48 recites the limitation "its handle proximate inlet end" in line 11; "attachment member" in line 21; "intermediate member" in line 24; and "its handle

proximate end" in lines 24-25. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.

b. In claims 49, line 3, the language "preferably" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear what the limitations, if any, such places on the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

c. Regarding claim 51, the phrase "or the like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

d. The term "notional diameter" in claims 55 and 56 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "notional diameter" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section

351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 48-51, 54, 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 02/19919 A2 (cited by applicant; hereinafter "WO '919").

e. WO '919 discloses main structural member (see fig. 1) with handle region 20, distal region 30 and intermediate region (embodied by 32); light duct 40; attachment apparatus 31; and shielding member 65. Additionally, WO '919 discloses the light duct can be plastic (see pg. 11, l. 12-19); light cable 27; and the light duct has a substantially flattened portion and a non-flattened form (see fig. 1; 44 and 49, respectively).

f. With regard the statements of intended use and other functional statements, they do not impose any structural limitations on the claims distinguishable over WO '919 which is capable of being used as claimed if one so desires to do so. *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Furthermore, the law of anticipation does not require that the reference "teach" what the subject patent teaches, but rather it is only necessary that the claims under attack "read on" something in the reference. *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 218 USPQ 781 (CCPA 1983). Furthermore, the manner in which a device is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ2d 1647 (1987).

g. Concerning specifically claim 50, the language: "the light duct is a fabrication from two moulded components" is considered a product-by-process

limitation. It is noted that the device of WO '919 appears to be substantially identical to the device claimed, although the process in which is produced is not specified, therefore the burden is upon the applicant to come forward with evidence establishing an unobvious difference between the two. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

7. Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,562,832 to Wilder et al. (cited by applicant; hereinafter "Wilder"). Wilder discloses structural member 11 having handle 13, curved region 14, and distal region 12; light ducting means 16 with inlet 16A and emission zone 16B; light source 23; provision for mounting battery (see col. 6, l. 52-61); and shield 17.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 52, 53, 55, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO '919. WO '919 discloses the claimed inventions, but not specifically the claimed ranges. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the invention of WO '919 within the claimed ranges, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

10. Claims 61 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilder. Wilder discloses the claimed inventions, but not specifically the having a switch. A switch was known in the art at the time of the invention to turning on and off a light source. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the invention of Wilder having a switch in order to turn on the light source.

***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAY R. SIGLER whose telephone number is (571)270-3647. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8 AM to 4 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. R. S./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3733  
/Eduardo C. Robert/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733